Are Your Values Mine? Exploring the Influence of Value Congruence on Responses to Organizational Change in a Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Department

Jon Welty Peachey
Texas A&M University

Jennifer Bruening
University of Connecticut

Only recently have scholars begun to focus on individual difference factors which can affect responses to organizational change. One individual difference factor neglected by previous research that may have an influence on responses to change is value congruence, or the similarity of values between the individual and the organization. Within the business and sport management fields, there have been few studies that have examined value congruence and organizational change, and none within the intercollegiate athletics context. Therefore, the current research was undertaken to explore the influence of value congruence on employee and student-athlete responses to organizational change in an NCAA Football Championship Subdivision intercollegiate athletic department. Findings revealed that individuals holding benevolence (concern for welfare of close others) values congruent with the organizational value orientation were more accepting of change than individuals holding achievement (obtaining resources for survival, i.e., winning) and power (focus on social status and prestige) values incongruent with organizational values. Theoretical and practical implications are provided, as well as directions for future research.

Keywords: organizational change, value congruence, resistance to change, values, intercollegiate athletics

Within the business management and sport management fields, organizational change is a topic that has engendered significant scholarship. Organizational change can be defined as any planned or unplanned response to external or internal pressures and forces which can be developmental, transitional or transformational in

Welty Peachey is with the Department of Health & Kinesiology, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. Bruening is with the Department of Kinesiology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

nature (Jick & Peiperl, 2003). While many of these works have centered upon forces driving change and change process (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2004; Greenwood & Hinings, 1996; Hannan & Freeman, 1984; O'Brien & Slack, 2003; Slack & Hinings, 1992, 1994; Welty Peachey & Bruening, 2011), only recently have scholars begun to examine individual difference factors which influence stakeholder responses to change, such as personality dispositions, previous negative experience with change, tenure and age (Caldwell, Herold, & Fedor, 2004; Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999; Meston & King, 1996; Oreg, 2003). Responses to change can vary from acceptance to resistance to ambivalence, where an individual might have mixed feelings and beliefs about the change (Piderit, 2000).

However, one individual difference factor neglected by previous research that may have an influence on responses to change is value congruence (Lamm, Gordon, & Purser, 2010). Value congruence is defined as the similarity of values between the individual and the organization (Kalliath, Bluedorn, & Strube, 1999; Kristof, 1996; Lamm et al., 2010). Organizational change could cause a misfit between the relatively stable personal values of an employee and the perception of values espoused by the organization (Bordia, Hobman, Jones, Gallois, & Callan, 2004). Consider, for example, the case where a new athletic director takes the helm of an intercollegiate athletic department and changes the focus and evaluative mechanisms from individually-based tasks and assignments to a work team environment. Employees that have more collectivistic values might be expected to embrace this change more because the work team culture fits with their personal value orientation. Conversely, those employees holding individualistic values might offer resistance, as the new collectivistic value orientation of work teams would be incongruent with their personal value set.

Surprisingly, while there has been a great deal of work examining the fit between an employee and the organization (Amos & Weathington, 2008), very little research has been done in either the business management or sport management traditions exploring the role of value congruence in shaping responses to organizational change (Amis, Slack, & Hinings, 2002; Kabanoff, Waldersee, & Cohen, 1995). To our knowledge, only one study on values and change has been conducted in the sport industry, that being Amis et al.'s (2002) work with Canadian amateur sport organizations. However, that study addressed value congruence at the institutional level across multiple organizations instead of within one organization, and was also not set in the context of U.S. intercollegiate athletics. Business management scholars have suggested that more research is needed in a variety of settings to investigate the role of value congruence in organizational change (Amos & Weathington, 2008), and Amis et al. have called for more studies within the sport industry on the role of values in organizational change to enhance our practical and theoretical understanding.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the influence of value congruence on employee and student-athlete responses to organizational change in a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) intercollegiate athletic department in the U.S. Research questions guiding this study were: (a) What are the organizational value priorities being espoused through the organizational change?; (b) What are employee and student-athlete personal value orientations?; and (c) How does value congruence influence responses to organizational change?

Concepts and Theoretical Framework

To explore the effect of value congruence on employee and student-athlete responses to organizational change, we adopted Schwartz's (1992) widely-used values typology to help us understand the types of personal and organizational values held by stakeholders and the organization. In addition, we coupled this typology with the person-environment fit theoretical framework (Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Pervin, 1989; Schneider, 1987) to further ground our study in the literature.

The Nature of Values

An exploration of the role of value congruence in shaping responses to change within one intercollegiate athletic department must be grounded in the broader context of American values and the values associated with sport and intercollegiate athletics. Academicians have contended that modern sport is infused with societal values, and that sport then reflects and promotes these value systems (Breivik, 1998). As Coakley (2009) commented, "American values clearly affect American sport" (p. 58). In American society, societal values mirrored through sport include success, competition, valued means to achieve (i.e., sport fosters individual achievement through hard work, perseverance and sacrifice), progress, materialism and external conformity (i.e., sport, as does society, expects conformity and not deviance; Coakley, 2009; Eitzen & Sage, 1999). The context of intercollegiate athletics in the U.S. reflects many of these societal values (Cooper & Weight, 2011). In addition, sport management scholars have pointed to the dualism and competing values associated with intercollegiate athletics (Baxter, Margavio, & Lambert, 1996; Cooper & Weight, 2011; Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). The one value orientation and conceptualization of legitimate conduct is toward winning, profit maximization and commercialism commonly seen in revenue sports, while the other is centered upon education, developing the well-rounded human being, and the core values seen in Olympic sports (Baxter et al., 1996; Cooper & Weight, 2011).

Recently, a significant amount of empirical attention has been directed to the typology and measurement of value priorities, and the relationship between values, norms, goals and behaviors (Elizur & Sage, 1999). Values (a) are beliefs that transcend specific situations, (b) pertain to desirable end states or behaviors, (c) guide selection or evaluation of behavior or events, and (d) vary in terms of relative importance (Schwartz, 1992). Values are "the criteria people use to select and justify actions and to evaluate people (including the self) and events" (Schwartz, 1992, p. 1). Personal values tend to be relatively permanent (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998), although there may be some variations due to changes in social conditions (Schwartz, 1992). Individual values guide individual decisions and have a direct effect on behavior in the workplace (Adkins, Ravlin, & Meglino, 1996; Cable & Edwards, 2004).

However, while organizational theorists have raised our awareness about the ways in which values affect organizational life, there has been very little research into how values influence the change process, and as a result, this is an area that needs further development (Amis et al., 2002; Kabanoff et al., 1995). Values underpin the ways in which organizations are designed and operated, and the structures and systems of an organization are an embodiment of its organizational

values (Amis et al., 2002). As such, any large-scale changes to the structures and systems of an organization may necessitate a shift in values, while conversely, a change in the value orientation of an organization is likely to be accompanied by a change in its structural design (Ranson, Hinings, Greenwood, & Walsh, 1980). Perceived organizational values may also change due to changes in leadership and strategy (Schein, 1990). Thus, the alignment between structural elements, strategy and values should undergird a comprehensive understanding of the change process (Amis et al., 2002).

While numerous typologies of values have been advanced over the years (e.g., Gordon, 1975; Rokeach, 1973), we adopted Schwartz's (1992) comprehensive value framework, as it has received significant attention and application from scholars due to the fact that its value types have been shown to be universal across countries and cultures (Cable & Edwards, 2004), and because of its applicability to the intercollegiate sport context (Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). Collecting data on 57 values from the literature, Schwartz subjected them to multidimensional scaling to derive 10 types or clusters of values (presented and defined in Table 1). Individualistic values focus on one's self-interest and are comprised of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation and self-direction, whereas collectivistic values center around collective interests and include benevolence, tradition and conformity. Universalism and security are classified as mixed, as they serve both self and collective interests (Schwartz, 1992).

Earley and Gibson (1998) found that collectivistic values were associated with social goals and equality processes, while individualistic values were related to prestige, financial incentives, and performance based achievement. Zhou and Martocchio (2001) discovered that collectivistic values tended to be related to maintaining and developing positive relationships with coworkers, whereas individualist values were associated with resource allocation decisions. Within the intercollegiate context, Trail and Chelladurai (2002) found that among faculty and students at an NCAA Division I athletic program known for its athletic success, power values were positively associated with athletic performance goals such as winning, financial security, visibility/prestige and entertainment. They also discovered that universalism values were positively related to student development goals like academic achievement, careers and health/fitness. However, to date, no previous works have specifically applied Schwartz's (1992) value scheme to the study of responses to organizational change.

Person-Environment Fit

As the relatively few studies which have examined the influence of value congruence in the organizational change process have adopted a person-environment fit (P-E fit) perspective (Branson, 2008; Caldwell et al., 2004; Lamm et al., 2010), we also embraced this lens to inform our work. In addition, most value congruence studies regardless of focal area have been guided by the P-E fit framework (Cable & Judge, 1996; Kristof, 1996). The concept of P-E fit has been prevalent in the management literature for over 100 years (e.g., Lewin, 1935; Murray, 1938; Parsons, 1909). It gained renewed importance with Tom's (1971) work matching personality with the organization, and has since moved predominantly into the area

Table 1   Interpersonal Values

Value Clusters	Description
Individualistic values	
Self-direction	Independent thought and action; being able to create, explore, and choose one's own way in life, derived from the individual's need for control and mastery over his/her own situation and the interactional requirements of autonomy and independence
Stimulation	Excitement, novelty, and challenge in the individual's life: derived from the organismic need for variety and stimulation to maintain an optimal level of activation
Hedonism	Pleasure or sensuous gratification for oneself: derived from organismic needs and the pleasures associated with satisfying those needs
Achievement	Derived from the requirement and need to obtain resources for survival and for the success of social interaction and institutional functions: personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards, thereby obtaining social approval
Power	The attainment and preservation of social status and prestige, in addition to control or dominance over people and resources: derived from the requirement of status differentiation in the functioning of social institutions and the individual need for dominance and control
Collectivistic values	
Conformity	Restraint of one's own actions, inclinations and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms: derived from the requirement that individuals inhibit inclinations that might be socially disruptive so that interaction and group functioning can run smoothly
Tradition	Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that one's culture or religion impose on the individual: derived from the symbols and practices that represent a group's shared experience and fate, and presumed guarantors of its survival
Benevolence	Concern for the welfare of close others in everyday interaction: derived from the need for positive interaction to promote the flourishing of groups and from the organismic need for affiliation
Mixed (both)	
Security	Safety, harmony, and stability of society, of relationships, and of self: derived from basic individual and group requirements
Universalism	Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection of the welfare of all people and of nature: derived from those survival needs of groups and individuals that become apparent when people come into contact with those outside the extended primary group and become aware of the scarcity of natural resources

Note: The descriptions of these value clusters are adapted from Schwartz (1992, pp. 7–12).

of values (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). The essence of P-E fit theory is that individuals prefer an environment that possesses characteristics (e.g., values, beliefs) that are similar to their own (Amos & Weathington, 2008). In a recent meta-analysis of the P-E fit literature, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) advance that P-E fit is multidimensional and comprised of four different types of fit: (a) person-job fit is the relationship between an individual's characteristics and those of the job or tasks that are performed at work; (b) person-group fit focuses on the interpersonal compatibility between an individual and his or her work group/team; (c) person-supervisor fit involves the value congruence between the leader and followers, and (d) person-organization fit addresses the compatibility of fit between individuals and entire organizations.

In our study, we were concerned primarily with person-organization fit (P-O fit), although elements of person-supervisor fit did emerge from the data (see discussion). Specifically, P-O fit can be defined as "the congruence between patterns of organizational values and patterns of individual values, defined . . . as what an individual values in an organization, such as being team-oriented or innovative" (Chatman, 1991, p. 459). The emphasis is on the match between the individual's values and the value system and priorities of the organizational context and the potential effects of this congruence or incongruence on employees' attitudes and behaviors within the organization (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). Within the P-O fit tradition, researchers have focused on two different types of fit—complementary and supplementary (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Kristof, 1996). Complementary fit occurs when an individual's or an organization's characteristics provide what the other wants. This can mean that an employee possesses a skill set that an organization needs, or that an organization offers the rewards than an employee wants (Cable & Edwards, 2004). Complementary fit research has generally focused on psychological needs fulfillment (Edwards, 1991). Supplementary fit, on the other hand, exists when an individual and an organization possess similar or matching characteristics. Most often, research in the supplementary fit tradition has operationalized P-O fit as value congruence between employees and organizations (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Kristof, 1996).

Generally, research supports a positive relationship between congruence of employee and organizational values with employee attitudes toward the organization (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Branson, 2008; Cable & Judge, 1996; Chatman, 1991; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Essentially, when value congruence is maximized, employee attitudes are more positive, and when there is value incongruence, employee attitudes are more negative (Cable & Edwards, 2004). Value congruence has been shown to be positively related to job satisfaction (Adkins & Caldwell, 2004; Amos & Weathington, 2008; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999), satisfaction with the organization (Amos & Weathington, 2008), affective and normative commitment (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Caldwell et al., 2004; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999), increased productivity (Goodman & Svyantek, 1999), salary and success in the organization (Bretz & Judge, 1994), lower levels of stress and greater health (Saks & Ashforth, 1997), and organizational citizenship behavior (Cable & DeRue, 2002; Goodman & Svyantek, 1999). Value congruence is also negatively related to turnover and intentions to quit (Amos & Weathington, 2008; Cable & DeRue, 2002; Caldwell et al., 2004).

P-O Fit and Organizational Change.   Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) framework within the P-O fit tradition outlines how organizations become homogenous and support a high degree of value congruence between members and an organization. In the attraction phase, individuals are attracted to an organization that has similar attributes. Next, organizations select individuals with specific competencies and attributes that fit the organization (selection). Finally, in the attrition phase, those employees that do not fit with the organization will voluntarily leave or be asked to leave. Therefore, this process results in greater homogeneity within the organization and a high degree of congruence between members and the organization (Ostroff & Rothausen, 1997). During organizational change, if the change is perceived to modify key attributes of the organization (e.g., a new organizational value priority), employees may reevaluate their attraction to the organization, which will be reflected in their responses to organizational change (Lamm et al., 2010).

Thus, "values alignment is the bedrock of successful organizational change" (Branson, 2008, p. 377). Employees' personal values are subliminal drivers of behavior, and if employees do not support the collective values of the organization, it will be extremely difficult for the change programs to be successful (Branson, 2008). Indeed, radical organizational change is only possible if the dominant value set of organizational members is consistent with the prescribed changes (Amis et al., 2002). Employees may not support new organizational value priorities if they believe that these new values threaten their identity, or that their personal identities and values are dislodged through the organizational change effort (Smollan & Sayers, 2009). As such, organizational change can act as a trigger which forces employees to reevaluate the degree of value congruence with the organization. If employees perceive that the changes have resulted in the organization embracing new value priorities which are not congruent with their own personal value systems, responses to change will be more negative. On the other hand, if employees perceive the organizational changes to result in enhanced value congruence, responses to change may be more positive (Lamm et al., 2010).

As mentioned, there have only been a few studies in business and sport management that have examined the influence of value congruence in the organizational change process, and none situated in the intercollegiate sport context. Smollan and Sayers (2009) conducted a qualitative investigation with 24 individuals across multiple industry sectors in New Zealand, finding that employees who had values more congruent with those of the organization reacted more positively during organizational culture change. Among MBA students and nonprofit organization employees, Lamm and colleagues (2010) determined that perceived positive changes in value congruence with the organization led an individual to offer more behavioral support for organizational change, while changes that resulted in perceived value incongruence resulted in less behavioral support for change. In Branson's (2008) work with for-profit firms in Australia, he found that widespread resistance to organizational change resulted if there was a failure of change agents (i.e., those leading and guiding change) to attend to values alignment processes and strategies, and that change must engender alignment between personal and organizational values to be successful. Caldwell et al. (2004) studied 21 firms going through major transformational change, concluding that poor values fit as a result of the changes can have undesirable consequences for the organization (increased

voluntary turnover, decreased organizational commitment). In the education sector, Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006) discovered that when employees felt that their personal values were threatened by organizational change, they responded with defensiveness, shock, and lower levels of trust.

Amis et al. (2002) conducted the only study to date in the sport industry on values and organizational change. They collected data over a 12-year period from Canadian amateur sport organizations going through transformational institutional change, finding that organizations that contained members whose personal values were congruent with the organizational changes were successfully able to engage in the change process. On the other hand, organizations comprised of members whose values were incongruent with the changes entered into a period of superficial conformity, before reverting to structural designs more consistent with the values held within the organization. However, their work did not specifically center on the role of values in effecting responses to organizational change among employees within one organization. Thus, more research is needed within all segments of the sport industry, the intercollegiate context included, on the influence of value congruence on responses to change. As Caldwell et al. (2004) explained, "researchers need to take a closer look at 'fit' issues as possible explanations of the relationship between change initiatives and individuals' reactions" (p. 868). In summary, to inform our research and answer our guiding research questions, we embraced Schwartz's (1992) values typology and the P-E fit framework, specifically, P-O fit (Chatman, 1991).

Method

The current study was part of a larger investigation into the factors influencing responses to change and forces driving change in a Division I FCS intercollegiate athletic department, which took place between October 2008 and March 2009. We conducted a qualitative, single case study, as qualitative methodology is appropriate for studying dynamic processes in organizations which are sensitive to individual interpretation (Maitlis, 2005), and for developing a holistic understanding of a phenomenon in its social context (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2003). Case studies are also appropriate for studying change because of their longitudinal focus (Bulmer, 1986). In addition, several researchers have called for the use of qualitative methods to examine values and organizational change, as quantitative measures confine answers to a limited number of closed-ended questions (Lamm et al., 2010; Smollan & Sayers, 2009). Data collection took place over a six-month timeframe. Our rationale for selecting this timeframe was to confine responses within one academic year, which in most cases insured that participants were still employed by, or students at, the university and that interviews could fit within their demanding schedules. For confidentiality purposes, pseudonyms have been assigned to all participants as well as locations identified in the data.

Research Setting and Nature of Change

A new athletic director (Mark) took the helm of East Coast University (ECU) 15 months before this study commenced. Mark was hired to lead change within a dissatisfied and disgruntled department. The previous culture was negative, with many staff adopting a mindset of mediocrity. Some employees did not feel like the previous athletic director cared about them or their program, and did not have a

high degree of trust in the athletics administration. For instance, Denny, the head track and field coach, said that trust was undermined because "he [the previous athletic director] would come tell you one thing and walk down the hall and do something totally different." This claim was echoed by Cheryl, the senior associate athletic director, who said that the culture under the previous athletic director was negative because "staff just retreated to their own islands and did their own things because of a lack of trust." Mark then instituted a new culture based on trust, accountability, communication and relationships. In addition, he adopted a new core philosophy that centered upon the student-athlete, where Mark called on all staff to make decisions based upon what was in the best interests of the student-athlete. While Mark felt that winning was important, he believed that creating a positive student-athlete experience was equally important. For instance, Mark said that "at no time have I said that I do not want to win. But, I believe we can win by having our moral compass on the student-athlete." Under the previous regime at ECU, winning was emphasized above all else, in line with the dominant logic in the field of Division I intercollegiate athletics (Washington & Ventresca, 2004), which advances winning as the primary metric.

In addition, four years before Mark's arrival, ECU switched conferences to one that was considered more competitive and prestigious. This was a significant organizational change for the university. As a consequence, Mark funneled more monies to revenue sports such as football and men's basketball to improve their competitiveness in the new conference and, according to Mark, to "improve the student-athlete experience for these young men." He believed that by providing more resources to these teams—in line with resources provided to football and men's basketball teams by other universities in the conference—the experience for the student-athlete would be maximized. Last, Mark brought in a flatter organizational structure, which moved senior management closer to front-line staff. Mark made these adjustments to enhance communication, as he felt that the communication between senior staff and support staff was dysfunctional under the previous regime. Mark enacted all organizational changes except for the conference realignment. Due to the nature and amount of change, we considered this setting to be appropriate for investigating value congruence and responses to change. As a private university in the Northeast, ECU offered 19 varsity sports for 520 student-athletes, and employed 90 full-time and 31 part-time staff, as well as 130 student workers.

Data Collection

We were guided by Yin's (2003) data collection suggestions for qualitative case studies. We employed semistructured personal interviews, direct observations, document analysis, and a review of physical artifacts and historical records of the department. The first author served as principal investigator and conducted data collection. We purposively selected 25 employees and student-athletes to participate in the study, guided by the premise that individuals who can best answer the research questions should be strategically selected as participants, and by Creswell's (1998) contention that interviewing 20–25 individuals is sufficient to achieve data saturation in case studies.

First, we conducted two semistructured personal interviews with each participant, spaced three to five months apart after the major changes had already been implemented, to ascertain if responses to change varied over a short time period.

Top, middle, and lower level managers were represented in the sample, and student-athletes were included as respondents because they would be the beneficiaries of the changes, as many were designed to improve the student-athlete experience. So that we could gauge responses to change from newly hired as well as longer tenured employees, we selected respondents with a wide range of tenure (i.e., from one month to 24 years). Data saturation was achieved after interviewing 25 individuals when no new themes or threads emerged from the data (Creswell, 1998). Fourteen men and 11 women were interviewed (see Table 2 for demographic characteristics).

Initial interviews lasted 45–60 min for change recipients (employees and student-athletes) and 75–90 min for the change leader (the athletic director), with follow-up interviews taking 30–45 min. The first author engaged in a pilot study with four NCAA Division I senior athletic administrators before initiation of this study. Our interview guides were drawn from the pilot study, and also informed by Schwartz's (1992) values typology and by the value congruence and P-O fit literature (Branson, 2008; Caldwell et al., 2004; Chatman, 1991; Lamm et al., 2010). Sample interview questions included: (a) describe what you value in your personal life; (b) describe the values of your athletic department; (c) describe the organizational changes that have taken place in the department since the new athletic director came on board; (d) how did you respond to these organizational changes?; and (e) why do you think you responded in this way? Interviews were transcribed verbatim by the first author and a professional transcription service.

As a second data collection method, the first author observed senior staff and all-staff meetings, home athletic contests and team practices. Mark informed athletic department personnel that the first author would be conducting observations, and that they could discuss any concerns with the first author. No staff members expressed any concerns. Before the first meetings, the first author read a consent script, which explained the nature of the study, and that anyone could leave if they did not wish to be observed. No staff members left any of the meetings. The first author did not interact with anyone during meetings, practices or games. Finally, documents, historical records and artifacts of the department were examined. These included 50 current documents (e.g., media guides, game programs, websites), 127 documents published between 1925 and 2006, office spaces, competition facilities and other memorabilia. These examinations continued until data saturation, which was achieved when emerging themes began to reinforce findings from other data collection methods.

Data Analysis

We adopted the open, axial and selective coding process recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Open coding was used during the initial stage of analysis to condense data into preliminary categories. Some of these codes were assigned a priori based on Schwartz's (1992) values typology and the P-O fit framework (Chatman, 1991), while others emerged during the study (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Sample open codes included benevolence (collectivistic values), power and achievement (individualistic values), organizational value priorities, athletic director values, value congruence, and value incongruence. Following Schwartz, individuals were classified as holding benevolence values if their words and actions primarily centered upon putting the student-athlete first and student-athlete welfare.

Table 2   Demographic Characteristics, Responses to Change and Value Orientations of Study Participants

Name	Sex	Age	Ethnicity	Role	Years with Dept.	Response to Change	Value Orientation
Ally	F	21	Caucasian	Field hockey athlete	3	Acceptance	Benevolence
Andy	M	41	Caucasian	Coord.—strength & conditioning	18	Ambivalence	Achievement
April	F	31	Caucasian	Athletics operations manager	4 months	Acceptance	Benevolence
Barry	M	49	Caucasian	Head women's crew coach	17	Acceptance	Benevolence
Cathy	F	32	Caucasian	Assist. fitness director	6	Ambivalence	Achievement
Cheryl	F	34	Caucasian	Senior associate athletics director	3	Acceptance	Benevolence
Dan	M	32	Caucasian	Athletic trainer	3	Acceptance	Benevolence
Danielle	F	19	Caucasian	Office assistant	2	Acceptance	Benevolence
Dave	M	20	Caucasian	Office assistant	3	Acceptance	Benevolence
Denny	M	57	African–American	Head track & field coach	19	Ambivalence	Benevolence
Helen	F	58	Caucasian	Athletic dept. office manager	23	Acceptance	Benevolence
Janet	F	48	Caucasian	Head field hockey coach	21	Resistance	Achievement
Jennifer	F	26	Hispanic	Assist. women's basketball coach	2	Acceptance	Benevolence
Kathryn	F	26	Caucasian	Football adm. assistant	1	Resistance	Power
Kent	M	42	Caucasian	Associate head coach—football	5	Ambivalence	Achievement
Kerry	F	23	Caucasian	Women's ice hockey athlete	5	Acceptance	Benevolence
Kevin	M	27	Caucasian	Sports information director	7	Ambivalence	Power
Larry	M	47	Caucasian	Director club sports	5	Ambivalence	Power
Laura	F	31	Caucasian	Assist. compliance director	1 month	Acceptance	Benevolence
Mark	M	51	African–American	Athletics director	3	Acceptance	Benevolence
Nate	M	33	Caucasian	Head equipment manager	3	Resistance	Achievement
Sam	M	65	Caucasian	Head baseball coach	24	Resistance	Achievement
Thomas	M	51	Caucasian	Associate AD—external affairs	2 months	Acceptance	Benevolence
Tim	M	23	Caucasian	Football athlete	5	Acceptance	Achievement
Zach	M	22	Caucasian	Baseball athlete	5	Acceptance	Benevolence

Given that ECU is a Division I university, all individuals talked about winning to a certain degree, but those that positioned winning within the broader scope of doing well by the student-athlete were deemed to hold benevolence values. If individuals' words and actions primarily focused on acquiring prestige, influence and status in the department or the university, they were classified as holding power values. Similarly, if individuals' words and actions predominately focused on the value of winning, they were classified as holding achievement values. Individuals holding power and achievement values may have partly aligned with the student-centered value orientation, but if they stated that their overarching goals and focus were to improve status or win, they were classified as having power and achievement value orientations. Following the open coding process, these preliminary codes were organized into axial codes, where categories, concepts and themes were identified which could be grouped together (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). These themes are presented in the results section which follows. Last, selective coding entailed integrating the data from all data collection methods to support the emerging conceptual codes (Creswell, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

To enhance the dependability and credibility of the study, we employed triangulation of measures and investigators (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Multiple data collection methods were tapped to corroborate findings and reinforce themes. In addition, the first author conducted all interviews and handled coding of the data, while the second author, who did not code the data, reviewed interpretations and commented on the coding schemes to offer insight and critique. Both authors were in agreement as to the soundness of the coding scheme and interpretations, with no major differences noted. Member checks took place with all participants, where they were asked to review transcripts for accuracy and provide feedback on study conclusions, which enhanced credibility. No participants had any major changes to make to either their transcripts or interpretations. Finally, we provided a rich description of the setting and context to enhance transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), so that the study may be replicated without making widespread claims as to its generalizability.

Results

To begin, we first outline the new value orientation that Mark brought into the department, which we follow with a description of our two major themes related to value congruence—collectivistic value orientation and acceptance of change, and individualistic value orientation and resistance or ambivalence to change.

Organizational Value Priorities

Our first research question sought to uncover the organizational value priorities being advanced through the organizational change. As mentioned, when Mark took over as athletic director, he immediately instilled a new value priority for the department. Essentially, he believed that every decision, strategy or action in the department should be filtered through the lens of what is in the best interests of the student-athlete. Valuing the student-athlete and maximizing the collegiate experience for him or her, through a vibrant athletics program that complemented

the student's life at the university, was at the heart of his philosophy. This is in line with the benevolence value priority within the collectivistic value set (see Table 1), which is concerned with the welfare of close others in everyday interaction (Schwartz, 1992). Mark summed up his student-athlete focus as follows:

> From the very first meeting I had with the staff, I talked about how one of our goals, one of our core values, has to be putting the student-athlete first. Every decision we make, we want to make with regard to what is in the best interests of the student-athlete. And then trying to show examples through time of how we might do that. Using that as our compass.

In Table 3, the core values of the athletic department taken from Mark's revised policy and procedural manual are explained. These values clearly focus on the holistic development of the student-athlete. To Mark, competitive excellence, winning and success would ultimately derive through this focus on the student-athlete. He did not support a win-at-all-costs mentality that is present in many Division I athletic programs. At almost every staff meeting observed by the first author, and before each senior staff meeting, Mark would often reiterate this student-athlete first philosophy, and state that all decisions made as a result of these meetings, and all future strategic decisions, had to be made with the student-athlete as the moral compass. He would talk about being led by this value set in all activities of the department, no matter how large or small.

When staff, coaches and student-athletes were interviewed, every individual spoke about the student-athlete first philosophy as the major change that Mark brought to the department, and how this was drastically different than the values under the previous regime. Before, under the prior athletic director, there was much more of an emphasis on doing what it took to win, and only lip service paid to valuing the student-athlete. For example, Denny, spoke about the focus of the previous athletic director, saying that "I don't really feel that he was about the program. . . . He was about his legacy . . . and his whole perspective was about

Table 3   Five Core Values of the Athletic Department

Leadership: Promoting and developing leadership in each student-athlete and staff member to create an environment where every person feels empowered to make a difference and achieve excellence.

Critical Thinking: Establishing critical thinking as an essential part of the educational process for both student-athletes and staff.

Coach as Educator: Creating the expectation that each coach will consider himself or herself an educator; not only of a particular sport but of all aspects of the student-athlete experience.

Appreciation of Difference: Creating an environment where "difference" is not only accepted but is embraced as a vital part of achieving the highest level of excellence.

Community Service: Recognizing and fulfilling the responsibility to serve the community in ways that positively impact the lives of people from all backgrounds.

Note: Adapted from the athletic department's Policy and Procedures Handbook (2008)

football and basketball." Barry, the head women's rowing coach, captured Mark's new student-athlete first vision quite succinctly:

> He would like the coaches to be teachers and focus on their athletic experience here as part of their education. He's articulated it, to put the student-athlete first, in terms of their welfare, in terms of their physical well being, their mental well being, their academic performance. That's reflected in the academic performance overall of the athletic department, from the people that [Mark] has hired . . . and what he expects from us.

From a student-athlete perspective, Kerry, a senior women's ice hockey athlete, mentioned how Mark tried to improve the experience for the student-athlete. She commented that Mark would say, "'Okay, how can we make this better? How can we help you?' And so it's not just lip service. That we're really here for the athletes and we want to make it better, to help them develop." Barry also mentioned the fact that Mark hired new staff that aligned with his vision and student-athlete first value orientation. In fact, Mark commented that if during the interview process, he did not hear the candidate mention something along the lines of putting the student-athlete first, then that individual was no longer a viable candidate for the position. For instance, in the latest women's ice hockey media guide, it featured a quote from Mark talking about the new coach, who was in his first year with the program. Mark said that the coach would be a great fit with the department because "he embraced the concepts of coach as educator and leading through a student-athlete first philosophy."

In most publications produced by the athletic department under Mark's tenure, there was some mention of the student-athlete centered value orientation and concept of coach as educator. For example, a review of all of the media guides published since Mark took the reins revealed a concerted shift in language when talking about the goals of the department and the value of the student-athlete experience at ECU. While the guides also focused on competitive excellence and future success for each team, they did this within the language of a student-centered program. Many of the guides had features on the academic achievements of the athletes, with numerous testimonials from current and former athletes as to how participating in sports helped make them better students, better citizens, and ultimately more successful in the real world. The new policy and procedural manual, as well as the new student-athlete handbook, also had large sections devoted solely to student-athlete welfare and the student-athlete first value orientation. Each of these documents repeatedly referred to the five core values of the department (see Table 3). Thus, the student-athlete first value orientation was presented consistently and continuously by Mark in all forms of communication.

The Role of Value Congruence in Responses to Change

Our second research question sought to uncover employee and student-athlete value orientations, while our third question sought to ascertain how value congruence influenced their responses to change. Table 2 illustrates the value orientations of all respondents using Schwartz's (1992) typology, matched with their predominant response to change. Fifteen of the respondents held more collectivistic value orientations, predominately benevolence. All of these individuals but one was

accepting of the organizational changes. On the other hand, 10 respondents held more individualist values. Here, the three respondents holding power values were resistant or ambivalent to change. Of the seven respondents who held achievement values, six were resistant or ambivalent to the organizational changes, while only one, a student-athlete, was accepting. All four of the student-athletes, regardless of value orientation, were accepting of change. Furthermore, all senior administrators held benevolence values and were accepting of change, and most support staff held benevolence values and were supportive of change. Finally, of the six coaches interviewed, three held benevolence values and three were oriented toward achievement. Two of the coaches with benevolence values were accepting of change and one was ambivalent, while the three coaches holding achievement values were either resistant or ambivalent. In general, those individuals who aligned with the student-athlete first philosophy were more supportive of the change initiatives than those who were not as aligned with this new philosophy. Throughout the timeframe of the study (six months) over both waves of data collection, these value orientations and responses to change did not vary in any appreciable manner.

Collectivistic Value Orientation and Acceptance of Change.   As mentioned, the 15 individuals expressing benevolence as a collectivistic value orientation were predominately welcoming of Mark's organizational changes. These staff and student-athletes, in particular the new hires that Mark brought on board, were strongly aligned with the student-athlete first philosophy and very accepting of the changes. For instance, Laura was the new assistant director of compliance hired by Mark only one month before this study commenced. The principal manner in which the organizational changes impacted her was in providing her with new employment. Laura, who had a benevolence value orientation, talked during her first interview about how this value set of Mark's was one of the main deciding points as to why she chose to come and work for the department, saying that "I was so moved by how he approached his student-athletes and how he viewed his department. That's where I said, I put [ECU] on the radar, because I want to work for somebody like him." Laura was also very accepting of Mark's changes during her initial interview, commenting that "I'm absolutely 100 percent on board with the changes. We're all here for a common goal, to help the student-athletes." Four months later in her follow-up interview, her strong support remained: "I love it. The more I am working here at [ECU], the more ecstatic I am about the direction the department is going." Laura was also extremely supportive of Mark during staff meetings, where she was observed on numerous occasions offering vocal support for Mark's initiatives.

Jennifer, an assistant women's basketball coach, held benevolence values and aligned with Mark's student-athlete first vision. Through the organizational changes, more funds were being allocated to women's basketball and greater attention being paid to marketing of her program. Like Laura, she was also very accepting of the changes Mark was bringing to the department in her first interview:

> I think he emphasizes doing the right thing for the student-athletes and their well being. I feel like that message is coming across to all of the coaches. I know for us it has. That's something we really try to enforce with our kids. Trying to make sure we're doing the right thing for them and not just for a win.

In her follow-up conversation, Jennifer went on to say how this focus would eventually lead to long-term success: "I think you might not get short-term success from it maybe, but I think in the long run, I think it's definitely going to go a long way. And it just says something about the school's character." In addition, when observed at basketball practices and games, Jennifer always treated the student-athletes with respect, never yelling at them or verbally humiliating them.

Both Laura and Jennifer were relatively shorter-tenured employees who aligned with Mark's philosophy. However, Barry was a longer-tenured coach who also embraced Mark's new approach and held benevolence values as illustrated in the following comment:

> I think Mark has come in and set a very clear set of values . . . and made that almost the most important thing right now, rather than performance results. But I think if you set the right values . . . they will lead to performance results. I feel like I have a boss that has the same core values as I do. He's always said that this is not going to be a win-at-all-costs athletic department. I believe that's how athletics should be. In the end, I think he feels and I feel that that's a bigger part of our job than how many races we win.

While Barry had not yet received any additional monies for his program, he did feel that women's rowing, as well as other nonrevenue sports, were being valued more than in the previous administration. This was the principal way Mark's changes were impacting him to this point, creating a new sense of feeling valued in the department. Barry was highly supportive of Mark's changes in his first interview, relating that "I think it's great. I love it." Four months later in his follow-up interview, he continued to voice his support: "I am encouraged by the changes, and continue to feel that there's been a very positive change in terms of the support we get from the [athletic] administration." Barry was also observed on numerous occasions in staff meetings offering verbal support for Mark's initiatives, and as well, emphasized the character development of his student-athletes over winning when observed during one women's rowing team practice.

From a student-athlete perspective, Kerry expressed a benevolence value orientation during her first interview: "Right now, I volunteer a lot in the community, and try to give back to the team and mentor the girls on the team to be better individuals." At practices and during games, she was always observed providing encouragement to her teammates and treating her opponents with respect, win or lose. In addition, in her initial interview, she was very excited about Mark's new initiatives, commenting that "My reaction is . . . this is great! I'm really excited about it. I'm excited for my team, and I'm excited for other athletes." Like Barry, Kerry perceived Mark's administration to be valuing nonrevenue sports more highly than the previous administration, and this change resonated positively with her. In her follow-up interview, she said that "I am still excited about the changes, and am very appreciate of the support I feel like I get from the athletic department." This support was observed at three separate women's home hockey games, where four out of the five senior administrators, including Mark, were always in attendance. Kerry mentioned that in the previous administration, rarely did a senior administrator show up at a women's hockey game. Thus, respondents holding benevolence value orientations perceived their values to be congruent with the new organizational value priorities, and as such, were accepting of the organizational changes.

Individualistic Value Orientation and Resistance/Ambivalence to Change.   Five of the six respondents holding achievement individualistic values, most notably some of the longer-tenured coaches, were either resistant or ambivalent to Mark's change initiatives. For example, Sam was the head baseball coach and the longest-tenured employee in the department at 24 years, who held an achievement value orientation. The principal way in which Mark's changes impacted him was that he felt that Mark's philosophy of coaching was markedly different than his, and thus, he was at odds with Mark over this student-athlete first compass because Sam felt that Mark did not value winning as much as he should, and because he felt Mark did not value his coaching style. Sam said:

> I think [Mark] is probably an opposite personality to mine. In coaching, I am very much the aggressive, Type A, old school coach. I think [Mark's] preference is for the coach who is more laid back, less aggressive. Where I'm much more of the do as I say style of coaching . . . . So, in terms of [Mark's] approach to hugs rather than the carrot and the stick, that's going to be a different approach than I take.

At baseball practices and during one game, the first author observed Sam yelling at players, and verbally chastising and humiliating them to motivate them to try harder. He also geared most comments and activities toward winning, and never mentioned character development or appeared concerned about any issue other than winning the game. As well, Sam was usually critical of Mark's initiatives during staff meetings, often being the one staff member challenging Mark on his philosophy, and how this would help him win baseball games. During his first interview, Sam voiced his cautions with regards to how Mark's changes had impacted the baseball program and about Mark's philosophy: "He [Mark] hasn't been here long enough to . . . make decisions that impact the baseball program in any tangible, positive way. I also have concerns about his student friendly policy." He continued to voice his concerns four months later in his follow-up interview, saying that "I still have not seen any tangible impact on my team, and don't see how Mark's philosophy will help us win more games."

Janet, the head field hockey coach and another longer-tenured staff member, also described her coaching style as more old school and aggressive, and stated that "winning is very important to me, and that is my primary focus . . . I value the on-the-field stuff. " Like Sam, she held an achievement value orientation, and was not sure how this student-athlete first philosophy was going to necessarily win more championships and foster competitive excellence within the department. When observed at games and practices, she zeroed in on performance and winning as a metric, and was a demonstrative coach, yelling at players for mistakes and always emphasizing the importance of winning the next match at all costs. She talked during her first interview about her view on the student-first philosophy: "I disagree with the importance given to this philosophy, and that the occasional parent or complainer is going to have more of an impact with [Mark] than they should have." She was also frustrated that her field hockey program had not yet received any additional funds or support, as she felt that she needed more money and better facilities to be competitive. Janet explained in her follow-up interview that "I'm banging my head against the wall trying to win in this situation. I'm not sure how Mark's philosophy can help us do that [win]." To reinforce Sam and

Janet's comments, Denny shed light as to why he thought some coaches were not as aligned with where Mark wanted to take the department:

> People have different philosophies. We have an old-school component here. I'm here to coach, that's what my job description says, and that's all I'm going to do. 'Why do I have to worry about anything else, because that's all you pay me to do'? So it's . . . stubborn and old school. Coaches are sometimes the hardest people to adjust.

While Sam and Janet held achievement values and were resistant to Mark's changes, Larry, the director of club sports, was one of the three respondents holding a power value orientation who was ambivalent or resistant to the organizational changes. For example, during his first interview, Larry shared that "with the previous athletic director, I felt that my opinions were valued, and that I had some influence. I don't feel that I have the same type of relationship with Mark." Larry went on to say how he really missed the athletic director involving him more in department decisions and asking for his advice. Thus, in Mark's administration, he did not have as much power, status and prestige as in the previous administration. Larry was also ambivalent about Mark's changes, expressing mixed emotions and beliefs about the changes, as illustrated by this comment: "I'm just riding it out to see what he [Mark] wants. . . . my feeling is, let's see what happens . . . before I pass judgment." Three months later in his follow-up interview, this ambivalence remained for Larry and his employees in club sports, as he said that "so far as we're concerned, it's status quo. . . . There's still ambiguity as to how we feel about these changes."

When Mark was asked what he thought was the fundamental factor underlying any resistance to change in the department, he commented on value incongruence:

> I think part of it is because they may not be interested or committed to the same value set. And so the resistance comes from them not wanting to have to act in ways that I'm asking them to act. If you've been used to a relationship with your student-athletes that's based on fear, and now suddenly you've got an athletic director telling you that you want them to be treated as adults that have an opinion and we're here to help develop them as leaders, and you have to be approachable and open and respectful, well, you're asking people to change their stripes. Those that might be resistant for that reason are not real happy about it.

Mark went on to share that when he first took over as athletic director and began talking about his philosophy, some coaches expressed concern to his supervisor that they did not feel that Mark was committed to winning. Mark related that while he talked about aligning all decisions and actions toward what was in the best interests of the student-athlete during those initial staff meetings, not once did he mention that he did not want to win. Mark said that "don't you think it's interesting that people would equate that [putting the student-athlete first] to not being committed to winning? . . . I think that says more about the person who is giving you that feedback than it does about me."

In the final analysis, then, those staff and student athletes holding predominately benevolence value orientations (collectivistic) were aligned with the new organizational value orientation (student-first philosophy) and more open to change

than those staff who held achievement and power value orientations (individualist) and did not align with the new organizational value set.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of value congruence on employee and student-athlete responses to change in the intercollegiate context. First, we sought to ascertain the organizational value orientation being advanced through the organizational changes. We found that the athletic director's new student-centered philosophy and value system aligned with the benevolence value orientation within the collectivistic value cluster (Schwartz, 1992). Every decision or action made within the athletic department was supposed to be geared toward what would be in the best interests of the student-athlete. This new value orientation was the principal driver of change in the department, as the values-driven change led to shifts in resource allocations, priorities, and structure (Amis et al., 2002). The student-centered philosophy and benevolence orientation were also a departure from the dominant logics in the field of Division I athletics, which values the primacy of winning as a metric for performance outcomes (Washington & Ventresca, 2004). Baxter et al. (1996) have suggested that there are two competing conceptualizations of legitimate conduct within intercollegiate athletics: one value orientation is primarily centered upon winning and deriving a profit from activities, while the other is geared toward education and amateur athletic competition. Here, Mark was attempting to promote both conceptualizations of acceptable values and conduct within the department—valuing the student-athlete and educational experience while also valuing winning and competition (Baxter et al., 1996; Cooper & Weight, 2011). This dualism in values is a struggle of many intercollegiate athletic programs (Cooper & Weight, 2011). However, perhaps because of Mark's social justice background, where he served as executive director of a sport nonprofit organization before his role at ECU, he centered his rhetoric and behaviors on doing well by the student-athlete—not devaluing the importance of winning that is associated with American sport (Coakley, 2009; Eitzen & Sage, 1999), but rather, advocating that winning does not need to happen at the expense of the student-athlete.

We found that employees and student-athletes had a mix of personal value orientations, with 15 holding benevolence value priorities, and 10 achievement or power orientations. Consistent with other work in value congruence and change within the supplementary fit tradition of P-O fit research (Amis et al., 2002; Branson, 2008; Caldwell et al., 2004; Lamm et al., 2010; Smollan & Sayers, 2009), we found that value congruence played a significant role in responses to change. Those employees and student-athletes holding benevolence values and aligned with the student-centered philosophy were more accepting of change than those holding primarily achievement and power value orientations. In essence, those individuals engrained within the dominant logics of Division I athletics (Washington & Ventresca, 2004) were more resistant or ambivalent to Mark's changes, as they believed the new organizational values contradicted the traditional focus and mode of operating for a Division I athletic department. Mark's benevolent focus was a departure from this dominant logics of the primacy of winning at the Division I level.

Trail and Chelladurai's (2002) values research found that faculty and students at a NCAA Division I university holding power values supported goals for athletics

centered upon winning, whereas those individuals holding universalism values (i.e., understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection of the welfare of all people) aligned more with educational goals. They also found that more faculty and students held universalism rather than power and achievement values. In our study, these two foci were quite evident, as there were some individuals holding power and achievement values that thought winning should be the primary focus, while other individuals holding benevolence values (similar to universalism, but concerned for the welfare of close others rather than the welfare of all people) aligned more with educational goals. Power/achievement value orientations and the primacy of winning were more prevalent in our study than in Trail and Chelledurai's, likely because our sample consisted of athletic department employees and student-athletes rather than faculty and students at large.

In Schwartz's (1992) value system, benevolence is positioned adjacent to tradition and conformity and belongs within the larger domain of conservation, which would suggest that individuals holding benevolence values would be less open to change. On the other hand, the values of achievement and power are adjacent to the domain of openness to change. It is interesting, then, that our findings contradict this notion. Perhaps the context of intercollegiate athletics can help explain these findings. The domain of intercollegiate athletics values the process of cultivating rich traditions which foster pride and psychological attachment and commitment to the athletic program on behalf of various stakeholders (Welty Peachey & Bruening, 2011). Coaches especially are known to create traditions and routines that do not vary much from year to year, and if the strategies and processes are deemed as effective, some may be reluctant to try new approaches. However, most coaches, and many staff, also value achievement, winning, and competition. If organizational changes are seen as enhancing one's ability to win, compete or gain power, then it would be natural for that person to be more accepting of change. However, as was the case at ECU, if an employee holds an achievement or power value orientation (e.g., Sam, Janet, Larry) and the organizational changes threaten an employee's perceptions of his or her ability to compete or gain power, that employee will resist change. This is consistent with previous research that has found employees will resist change if they perceive threats to power and prestige (Goltz & Hietapelto, 2002). Therefore, the nature of change could also explain why our findings differ from Schwartz's (1992) scheme. Future research is needed in the intercollegiate context to explore these possibilities.

We also noted that not all individuals within a particular stakeholder group (i.e., coaches, student-athletes, support staff, senior administrators, etc.) held the same personal value priorities or similar responses to change. Normally, the focus of stakeholder management literature has been on the heterogeneity of views across, rather than within, stakeholder groups, assuming that individuals within a broad stakeholder classification will have homogenous views on issues. However, in their stakeholder analysis within an intercollegiate athletics context, Wolfe and Putler (2002) found that role-based self interest was not a sufficient "binding tie" of stakeholder group priorities; there was significant variance on views within broad stakeholder classifications. For instance, in our study, three coaches held benevolence values, with two of them accepting of change, and one ambivalent. Three other coaches held achievement values and were resistant.

Furthermore, the reasons for resistance or ambivalence varied among individuals. For Sam, the underlying reason for resistance was incongruence of his coaching philosophy with Mark's student-athlete first agenda, and the same can be said for Janet. However, Janet also expressed resistance because she had not yet received additional funding for her field hockey program, while other programs were receiving additional funding. Thus, to her, the old status quo was being perpetuated by Mark. Larry was resistant because as a result of the changes, he did not have as much power or influence as he did under the previous administration and felt threats to power and prestige (Goltz & Hietapelto, 2002). In addition, Denny was the one coach who expressed benevolence values and support of the student-centered philosophy, but who was also ambivalent about Mark's changes. For instance, when talking about Mark's philosophy during his first interview, Denny said that "I've always been student-first. . . . As a coach, that's what you should be doing." However, he was also ambivalent about Mark's changes, saying in his second interview that "I have mixed emotions presently about the organizational change. On one hand, I am happy about the help some of the other programs are getting. . . . As far as my own program, I am still waiting." Denny also said that "I'm not sure we have the resources necessary to do everything." He had not yet seen any impact on his program, did not believe that the internal resources had been marshaled to adequately support the changes, and thus was ambivalent over Mark's inability to achieve his goals. As Jick and Peiperl (2003) note, change initiatives which fail to achieve stated aims and goals due to insufficient resources can spark resistance on the part of employees, especially if they have witnessed failed change initiatives in the past.

Thus, the level of institutional support could moderate the relationship between value congruence and responses to change. Those individuals whose personal values are congruent with organizational values and who perceive high levels of institutional support could be more accepting of change than those individuals with congruent values but who perceive lower levels of institutional support. As well, if perceived lack of institutional support continues over time, an individual might express less benevolence values. This is an area that warrants further empirical investigation.

One could also argue that Mark's student-centered philosophy did not really constitute organizational change because 15 of the 25 individuals in this study already held benevolence value orientations, and that this orientation might be the prevailing organizational value set. However, upon closer scrutiny of the data, it can be seen that seven of the 15 individuals holding benevolence values were actually hired by Mark, and another three were student-athletes. Not counting Mark himself, that leaves only four employees in our sample that held benevolence values before Mark's tenure. As Mark illustrated in his comments earlier in this paper, he hired new employees only if they aligned with his philosophy. Thus, if our data are representative of the department as a whole, we cannot claim that the organizational value priority was benevolence before Mark's arrival, as many of the longer-tenured staff may hold achievement and power values.

Finally, we found it difficult to disentangle value congruence with the organization and value congruence with the supervisor. Recall that person-organization fit addresses the compatibility of fit between individuals and entire organizations,

whereas person-supervisor fit involves the value congruence between the leader and followers (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). In our study, respondents talked about Mark's student-centered philosophy as being the new organizational value priority. Thus, value congruence with the supervisor (Mark) and the organization (the athletic department) appear to be interwoven. In a typical intercollegiate athletic department, the supervisor and management are one and the same because of the smaller size of the organization. Thus, the athletic director in many cases is also the supervisor or not very far removed from front line employees. However, in large organizations where management is far removed from the employee, the immediate supervisor becomes the frame of reference. In this case, distinctions can be made between organizational values and supervisor values. Future work in this area should endeavor to disentangle these two constructs in relation to stakeholder responses to organizational change.

Limitations

As with all studies, our work has limitations which we need to acknowledge. Our study commenced 15 months after the new athletic director took the helm and instituted many of the organizational changes. As such, considerable variability in responses to change may have occurred before we launched this investigation. In addition, the six-month timeframe of the study may have been too short to fully capture how the impact of value congruence on responses to change evolved over time. Future studies should endeavor to track a single organization over several years. In addition, the first author's presence may have influenced the findings, as respondents may have adjusted their responses and behavior because they knew they were taking part in a study, or because they were fearful of reprisal if identified. We mitigated these concerns by instituting controls to maximize confidentiality, and by the first author's presence in the department over a six-month period to gain trust. Finally, researcher bias could have influenced the results (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To address this issue, we had the second author and a peer debriefer with intercollegiate athletics administration experience review interpretations, and we tested conclusions with respondents.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

From a theoretical standpoint, we have taken the P-O fit discourse on value congruence and change into a setting previously unexplored by value congruence researchers, that of NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletics. As far as we know, our study is the first to investigate the effects of value congruence on responses to change within the intercollegiate athletics context, and as such, we have contributed to our conceptual understanding of the factors influencing responses to change in this environment. Value congruence could be a highly salient factor underlying responses to change in the intercollegiate arena due to its competing values of winning and education. Thus, future models of change and responses to change should incorporate value congruence into our theorizing. Practically, our work also presents a number of direct applications for those leading change in the intercollegiate sport context. Managers guiding change should not assume that all stakeholders have the same value orientation, and must examine the effects of organizational changes on fit perceptions, and then orient all organizational actions and symbols toward

the new value orientation (i.e., any new organizational beliefs and values being advanced through organizational change) to be successful. Employees need to see how the application of the new value orientation will lead to better organizational performance, as this then enables alignment between personal and organizational values (Branson, 2008). Involving employees in the change process and communicating in an open, timely manner may also facilitate values alignment (Lamm et al., 2010). However, given that personal values are generally held to be relatively stable (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998), it may be in the best interests of managers leading change to hire new employees who have values congruent with the enacted changes and organizational value orientation to best enable organizational change success.

Future Research Directions

Several intriguing directions for future research also emerged from this study. There would be value in conducting similar studies in the NCAA Division II and III contexts, and even with larger Division I Football Bowl Championship schools, to ascertain the saliency of value congruence and responses to change in these environments. Moreover, how would value congruence emerge in other sport environments, such as professional or Olympic sport, where the emphasis is on winning by the most expeditious means possible or on upholding Olympic values? Future research should endeavor to answer these questions. Future studies should also explore the role of competing values with subcultures of an intercollegiate athletics department. Prior work has demonstrated that organizations will often have competing values between departments and subunits (Amis et al., 2002; Smollan & Sayers, 2009), but studies have not yet examined how subgroup value congruence effects responses to change (Lamm et al., 2010). If a subgroup (e.g., athletic team, operations, marketing) has different value priorities than the organization, how do its members then respond to large-scale organizational change initiatives?

Future longitudinal work should also investigate potential moderators of the value congruence/responses to change relationship, such as perceived institutional support, predisposition to resist change (Lamm et al., 2010), change process factors, tenure (Adkins et al., 1996), and other personality and situational variables (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Finally, more research is needed on how to foster value congruence during the change process, and of the consequences of value incongruence during change, such as voluntary turnover, decreased performance, low morale and cohesion, and decreased organizational commitment (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Lamm et al., 2010). The timeline of our study was too short to make conclusions on these outcomes. Thus, multiyear, longitudinal studies are needed to fully explore antecedents, moderators and consequences of value congruence and responses to change within a variety of sport contexts.

References

Adkins, B., & Caldwell, D.F. (2004). Firm or sub group culture: Where does fitting in matter most? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25,* 969–978. doi:10.1002/job.291

Adkins, C.L., Ravlin, E.C., & Meglino, B.M. (1996). Value congruence between co-workers and its relationship to work outcomes. *Group & Organization Management, 21,* 439–460. doi:10.1177/1059601196214005

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (2002). Values and organizational change. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science Behavior, 38,* 436–465. doi:10.1177/002188602237791

Amis, J., Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (2004). Strategic change and the role of interests, power and organizational capacity. *Journal of Sport Management, 18,* 158–198.

Amos, E.A., & Weathington, B.L. (2008). An analysis of the relation between employee-organization value congruence and employee attitudes. *The Journal of Psychology, 142*(6), 615–631. PubMed doi:10.3200/JRLP.142.6.615-632

Baxter, V.B., Margavio, A.V., & Lambert, C. (1996). Competition, legitimacy, and the regulation of intercollegiate athletics. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 13,* 51–64.

Bordia, P., Hobman, E., Jones, E., Gallois, C., & Callan, V.J. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Types, consequences and management strategies. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*(4), 507–532. doi:10.1023/B:JOBU.0000028449.99127.f7

Branson, C.M. (2008). Achieving organizational change through values alignment. *Journal of Educational Administration, 46*(3), 376–395. doi:10.1108/09578230810869293

Breivik, G. (1998). Sport in high modernity: Sport as a carrier of social values. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, XXV,* 103–118.

Bretz, R.D., & Judge, T.A. (1994). Person– organization fit and the theory of work adjustment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44,* 32–54. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1994.1003

Bulmer, M. (1986). The value of qualitative methods. In M. Bulmer, K.G. Banting, S.S. Blume, M. Carley, & C.H. Weiss (Eds.), *Social science and social policy* (pp. 180–203). London: Allen & Unwin.

Cable, D.M., & DeRue, D.S. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 875–884. PubMed doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.875

Cable, D.M., & Edwards, J.R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 822–834. PubMed doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.822

Cable, D.M., & Judge, T.A. (1996). Person-organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 67,* 294–311. doi:10.1006/obhd.1996.0081

Caldwell, S.D., Herold, D.M., & Fedor, D.B. (2004). Toward an understanding of the relationships among organizational change, individual difference, and changes in person-environment fit: A cross-level study. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 89,* 868–882. PubMed doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.868

Chatman, J.A. (1991). Matching people and organizations: Selection and socialization in public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36,* 459–484. doi:10.2307/2393204

Coakley, J. (2009). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cooper, C., & Weight, E. (2011). Investigating NCAA administrator values in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 4,* 74–89.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among 5 traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Earley, P.C., & Gibson, C.B. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism-collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management, 24,* 265–305. doi:10.1177/014920639802400302

Edwards, J.R. (1991). Person–job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C.L. Cooper & I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 283–357). New York: Wiley.

Eitzen, D.S., & Sage, G.H. (1999). *Sociology of North American Sport.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Elizur, D., & Sage, A. (1999). Facets of personal values: A structural analysis of life and work values. *Applied Psychology, 48*(1), 73–89. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00049.x

Endler, N.S., & Magnusson, D. (1976). *Interactional psychology and personality*. New York: Wiley.

Goltz, S.M., & Hietapelto, A. (2002). Using the operant and strategic contingencies models of power to understand resistance to change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 22*(3), 3–22.

Goodman, S., & Svyantek, D. (1999). Person-organization fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 55,* 254–275. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1998.1682

Gordon, L.V. (1975). *The measurement of interpersonal values*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C.R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 1022–1054.

Hannan, M.T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review, 49,* 149–164. doi:10.2307/2095567

Jick, T., & Peiperl, M. (2003). *Managing change: cases and concepts*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T.M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 107–122. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.1.107

Kabanoff, B., Waldersee, R., & Cohen, M. (1995). Espoused values and organizational change themes. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 1075–1104. doi:10.2307/256621

Kalliath, T.J., Bluedorn, A.C., & Strube, M.J. (1999). A test of value congruence effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20,* 1175–1198. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199912)20:7<1175::AID-JOB960>3.0.CO;2-5

Kavanagh, M.H., & Ashkanasy, N.M. (2006). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger. *British Journal of Management, 17,* 81–103. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00480.x

Kristof, A. (1996). Person-Organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*(1), 1–49. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1996.tb01790.x

Kristof-Brown, A.L., Zimmerman, R.D., & Johnson, E.C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology, 58,* 281–342. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00672.x

Lamm, E., Gordon, J.R., & Purser, R.E. (2010). The role of value congruence in organizational change. *Organization Development Journal, 28*(2), 49–64.

Lewin, K. (1935). *Dynamic theory of personality*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Maitlis, S. (2005). The social processes of organizational sensemaking. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(1), 21–49. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2005.15993111

Meglino, B.M., & Ravlin, E.C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management, 24,* 351–389.

Meston, C., & King, N. (1996). Making sense of "resistance": Responses to organizational change in a private nursing home for the elderly. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5,* 91–102. doi:10.1080/13594329608414843

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murray, H.A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

O'Brien, D., & Slack, T. (2003). An analysis of change in an organizational field: The professionalization of English Rugby Union. *Journal of Sport Management, 17,* 417–448.

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an individual differences measure. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 680–693. PubMed doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.680

Ostroff, C., & Rothausen, T.J. (1997). The moderating effect of tenure in person environment fit: A field study of educational organizations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 70,* 173–188. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00641.x

Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Pervin, L.A. (1989). Persons, situations, interactions: The history of a controversy and a discussion of theoretical models. *Academy of Management Review, 14,* 350–360.

Piderit, S.K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 783–794.

Ranson, S., Hinings, C.R., Greenwood, R., & Walsh, K. (1980). Value preferences and tensions in the organization of local government. In D. Dunkerley & G. Salaman (Eds.), *The international yearbook of organization studies* (pp. 197–221). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *Nature of human values*. New York: The Free Press.

Saks, A.M., & Ashforth, B.E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 50*(2), 395–426. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1997.tb00913.x

Schein, E. (1990). Organizational culture. *The American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109–119. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.109

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 437–453. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1987.tb00609.x

Schwartz, S.H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management, 6,* 114–132.

Slack, T., & Hinings, C.R. (1994). Institutional pressures and isomorphic change: An empirical test. *Organization Studies, 15,* 803–827. doi:10.1177/017084069401500602

Stake, R. (2000). Case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 435–454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smollan, R.K., & Sayers, J.G. (2009). Organizational culture, change and emotions: A qualitative study. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(4), 435–457. doi:10.1080/14697010903360632

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. London: Sage.

Tom, V.R. (1971). The role of personality and organizational images in the recruiting process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6,* 573–592. doi:10.1016/S0030-5073(71)80008-9

Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Perceptions of goals and processes of intercollegiate athletics: A case study. *Journal of Sport Management, 14,* 154–178.

Washington, M., & Ventresca, M. (2004). How organizations change: The role of institutional support mechanisms in the incorporation of higher educational visibility strategies, 1874-1995. *Organization Science, 15,* 82–97. doi:10.1287/orsc.1030.0057

Welty Peachey, J., & Bruening, J. (2011). An examination of environmental forces driving change and stakeholder responses in a Football Championship Subdivision athletic department. *Sport Management Review, 14*(2), 202–219. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2010.09.002

Wolfe, R.A., & Putler, D.S. (2002). How tight are the ties that bind stakeholder groups? *Organization Science, 13,* 64–80 10.1287/orsc.13.1.64.544.

Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zhou, J., & Martocchio, J.J. (2001). Chinese and American managers' compensation award decisions: A comparative policy-capturing study. *Personnel Psychology, 54,* 115–145. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2001.tb00088.x